

reauthorization bill that would improve the safety, quality, and accessibility of child care and after-school care for children from birth to age 13. High-quality, well-funded child care helps families work and children learn—both of which are important goals for the nation.

Since the last reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant in 1996, we have learned much about how to improve the quality of child care and after-school care and how to make child care assistance more accessible to families. Research on the importance of quality has spurred greater efforts to support providers in promoting children's positive development from birth. State initiatives have shown ways to encourage quality improvements through incentives and well-designed reimbursement policies. This bill incorporates these lessons from the research and state innovations in an effort to better protect the health and safety of children in care, improve the quality of care overall and for infants and toddlers in particular, facilitate children and families' sustained access to help in paying for care and more stable child care arrangements, and support providers serving families receiving child care assistance.

We strongly support the goals of this legislation. We will work with you to obtain the funding needed to make these improvements and to allow more children to benefit from these improvements. Between 2006 and 2012, 260,000 fewer eligible children received assistance through the Child Care and Development Block Grant. In addition, most states' payment rates for child care providers are too low to support high-quality care. To reverse the decline in children served and to successfully implement the much-needed improvements included in this legislation, we urge Congress to increase mandatory and discretionary child care funding.

Thank you for all your work on this reauthorization, which is so important for our country's children and families.

Sincerely,

HELEN BLANK,
*Director of Child Care
and Early Learning.*
JOAN ENTMACHER,
*Vice President for
Family Economic Security.*

CHILD CARE AWARE OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, September 15, 2014.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, Washington, DC.

Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
*Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Health,
Education, Labor and Pensions, Wash-
ington, DC.*

Hon. RICHARD BURR,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
*Chairman, House Education and the Workforce
Committee, Washington, DC.*

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
*Ranking Member, House Education and the
Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.*

Hon. TODD ROKITA,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. DAVE LOEBSACK,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARKIN, RANKING MEMBER ALEXANDER, SENATOR MIKULSKI, AND SENATOR BURR, CHAIRMAN KLINE, RANKING MEMBER MILLER, REPRESENTATIVE ROKITA, AND

REPRESENTATIVE LOEBSACK: I am writing on behalf of Child Care Aware® of America (formerly the National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies, NACCRRA) to express support for your legislation, the Child Care & Development Block Grant Act of 2014, which would reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant and would better protect the health and improve safety of children in child care settings across America.

Families want their children to be safe in child care. They reasonably assume that a child care license means the state has approved some minimum level of protection for children and that the program will promote their healthy development. Our nationwide polling shows that parents also believe there is oversight by the state. However, most state licensing requirements are weak and oversight is weaker.

For over 15 years, reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant has been Child Care Aware® of America's top legislative priority and we have been working on both the federal and state levels to improve the quality of child care.

Child Care Aware® of America has issued seven licensing studies that show state laws regarding child care settings vary greatly. The most recent report, *We Can Do Better: 2013 Update*, scored and ranked the states on their child care center program requirements and oversight policies. The average score was 92 out of a total possible score of 150—for a grade of 61 percent.

Children's early years are proven to be the most impactful time to create strong learners. This reauthorization bill is a huge step to move the nation forward ensuring children are safe and receiving the best early learning experiences while in child care. This bill sets the standard all families expect for their children by requiring providers to undergo comprehensive background checks, annual and pre-licensure inspections, and training.

This bill includes significant measures to improve the quality of child care and ensure that all children in child care settings are safe.

Child Care Aware® of America looks forward to working with you to pass this legislation into law. Thank you for your continued leadership in support of our nation's children.

Sincerely,

LYNETTE M. FRAGA, PH.D.,
Executive Director.

MICHELLE NOTH
MCCREADY,
Director of Policy.

L. CAROL SCOTT, PH.D.
*President, Board of
Directors.*

NICHOLAS P. VUCIC,
*Senior Government Af-
fairs Associate.*

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Finally, I would like to thank all of the Members of the House Education and the Workforce Committee and their staffs for their continued commitment to the well-being of American families.

Mr. Speaker, both Chambers and both parties have come together on a bipartisan basis to improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant. This bill is a strong example of what Congress can achieve by working together. The critical updates in the program will give American families the more support that they need and will better prepare our children for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleagues here on both sides of the aisle. It is not every day on this floor that we get to do that, but I thank them for their remarks and for the debate today.

I want to reiterate my appreciation for the work done on the other side of the Capitol. Again, it is not something we get to talk about every day, but this is an example of a time when we saw a need. Some could argue that we are a little overdue, since it has been 20 years since this has been reauthorized, but as the ranking member, Mr. MILLER, said, this is on the suspension calendar because we recognize that it needs to be done and because we have come together in a bipartisan-bicameral way to address this need.

So I urge my colleagues to support S. 1086, as amended, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I support S. 1086, reauthorizing the Child Care and Development Block Grant program.

We all talk about jobs bills.

Well, in my district, the Northern Mariana Islands, mothers and fathers in 200 families can go to their jobs every day because their children are being cared for through this program.

That's why it is important to reauthorize Child Care, because it helps people who want to work.

Especially in the Northern Marianas, where we are replacing foreign workers with U.S. workers, we need good child care to make that transition.

And the bill accounts for sudden changes of income, so even when the minimum wage increases in the Marianas this month—as I am glad to say it will—families will keep getting child care—and parents will keep working.

Lastly, S. 1086 improves standards, because all parents want to work without worry, knowing their children are well cared for and safe.

I urge passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1086, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5108) to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5108

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. USPTO LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—*The Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, as implemented by the Office, is established as a program entitled the “Law School Clinic Certification Program”. The Program shall allow students enrolled in a participating law school’s clinic to practice patent and trademark law before the Office by drafting, filing, and prosecuting patent or trademark applications, or both, on a pro-bono basis for clients that qualify for assistance from the law school’s clinic. The Director shall establish regulations and procedures for application to and participation in the Program. All law schools accredited by the American Bar Association are eligible for participation in the Program, and shall be examined for acceptance using identical criteria established by the Director. The Program shall be in effect for the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.*

(b) **REPORT ON THE PROGRAM.**—*The Director shall, not later than the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the Program, describing the number of law schools and law students participating in the Program, the work done through the Program, the benefits of the Program, and any recommendations of the Director for modifications to the Program.*

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—*In this section:*

(1) **OFFICE.**—*The term “Office” means the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

(2) **PROGRAM.**—*The term “Program” means the Law School Clinic Certification Program established in subsection (a).*

(3) **DIRECTOR.**—*The term “Director” means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5108, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5108, a bill to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

This bill has bipartisan support. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York, Congressman JEFFRIES, for his leadership on this issue, and I know that he will be speaking here on this matter shortly. It is my pleasure to be the principal Republican cosponsor of the bill which would

make this successful pilot program available to law schools all across the country.

This program was first established by the Patent and Trademark Office in 2008 and has allowed law students at 45 participating schools to practice patent or trademark law before the Patent and Trademark Office under the guidance of a supervisor. This practical experience is invaluable and is a worthwhile investment in our Nation’s future attorneys.

Expanding this program will also benefit our Nation’s small businesses. Through this program inventors and entrepreneurs will gain access to quality legal services and protections that they otherwise often could not afford. Additionally, establishing this program will improve the quality of applications submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office thereby hopefully streamlining the review process.

I am pleased to say that several universities from Ohio, my home State, were already selected to participate in the current pilot program. Those are Case Western Reserve University School of Law in the Cleveland area and the University of Akron School of Law.

The CBO has examined and scored this bill finding that the costs are quite reasonable, about \$200,000 a year to operate in all 45 participating schools so we are really getting a bang for our buck with this program.

I look forward to following the successes of this worthwhile program as it unfolds, and I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Once again I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for his leadership and the fact that this is a bipartisan bill. It is a good thing to see this type of bill move its way through the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 5108 is legislation designed to enhance the education of law students interested in practicing patent and trademark law while simultaneously helping small businesses, inventors, and entrepreneurs secure patents and trademarks.

I am pleased to partner with my distinguished Judiciary Committee colleague, Representative CHABOT, and am thankful for his support and leadership as well as for the support of Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS on this meaningful, bipartisan legislation.

This bill will permanently establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Currently this program exists only in pilot form; however, it has already helped budding intellectual property law students and attorneys and the innovation sector throughout the country.

The pilot program began in 2008 with only six law schools. Over time it grew to approximately 45 schools. To date

more than 1,400 law students have participated in this program.

Since the pilot began, law students under the supervision of a skilled and experienced faculty adviser have submitted 220 patent applications and approximately 650 trademark applications for clients on a pro bono basis. Establishing this program in law will both ensure its continuation and permit law schools throughout the country that meet the PTO’s qualifications to participate.

Intellectual property, of course, is a highly technical field. Ordinarily, students do not have the opportunity to submit patent and trademark applications until they become practicing attorneys. This program will provide real-world professional training, and expanding it will enable law students throughout the country to obtain invaluable practical experience that will not only enhance their legal education but will give students who participate in these clinics an opportunity to more meaningfully engage in the job market upon their graduation.

Beyond the advantage to law students, however, this program also provides significant benefits to inventors, entrepreneurs, and small businesses that qualify for pro bono assistance. Some of these inventors or small businesses may not be able to afford patent or trademark attorneys.

In the absence of this program, they may be forced to navigate the complicated legal terrain without technical and professional assistance. The small inventor or start-up company of today may very well become the next major American business of tomorrow in part due to the assistance of the student practitioners and their faculty advisers who participate in the PTO Law School Clinic Certification Program.

This legislation has the support of key stakeholders in the field including the Association of American Universities as well as the International Trademark Association.

In conclusion, let me again thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for his leadership on this bipartisan legislation. H.R. 5108 will help students, small businesses, inventors, startups, law schools, as well as the innovation economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, meaningful legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5108, the “USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program Act,” would make a law school clinic certification pilot program at the USPTO available to all law schools that provide an IP clinic program. I want to thank Rep. JEFFRIES and Rep. CHABOT and all the co-sponsors for putting forth this legislation.

Law school clinic programs provide practical hands on experience to law students, preparing them for the real world, and provide individuals and small business with an avenue for legal representation they may otherwise be unable to afford.

I expect that as the USPTO implements this program that they will continue to maintain rigorous standards, to ensure that these clinic programs meet the highest requirements and that the students participating meet the standard educational and professional criteria for practice before the office.

These IP law clinics are an essential part of law school and they are an important way for schools to help innovators and small businesses and start-ups in their local communities. I think this is a good bill and I support its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3006, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CIBOLA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE LAND EXCHANGE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3006) to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3006

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) MAP 1.—The term “Map 1” means the map entitled “Specified Parcel of Public Land in California” and dated July 18, 2014.

(2) MAP 2.—The term “Map 2” means the map entitled “River Bottom Farm Lands” and dated July 18, 2014.

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, CIBOLA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, ARIZONA, AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.—In exchange for the land described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to River Bottom Farms of La Paz County, Arizona, all right, title and interest of the United States in and to certain Federal land administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Land Management consisting of a total of approximately 80 acres in Riverside County, California, identified as “Parcel A” on Map 1. The conveyed land shall be subject to valid existing rights, including easements, rights-of-way, utility lines, and any other valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance under this section.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal land under subsection (a), River Bottom Farms shall convey to

the United States all right, title, and interest of River Bottom Farms in and to two parcels of land contiguous to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in La Paz County, Arizona, consisting of a total of approximately 40 acres in La Paz County, Arizona, identified as “Parcel 301–05–005B–9” and “Parcel 301–05–008–0” on Map 2.

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—The values of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section shall be equal or equalized by the payment of cash to the Secretary by River Bottom Farms, if appropriate, pursuant to section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)). The value of the land shall be determined by the Secretary through an appraisal performed by a qualified appraiser mutually agreed to by the Secretary and River Bottom Farms and performed in conformance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (U.S. Department of Justice, December 2000). If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land (“Parcel 301–05–005B–9” and “Parcel 301–05–008–0” on Map 2) exceeds the value of the Federal land (“Parcel A” on Map 1), the surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered to be a donation by River Bottom Farms to the United States.

(d) EXCHANGE TIMETABLE.—The Secretary shall complete the land exchange under this section not later than one year after the date of the expiration of any existing Bureau of Land Management lease agreement or agreements affecting the Federal land (“Parcel A” on Map 1) to be exchanged under this section, unless the Secretary and River Bottom Farms mutually agree to extend such deadline.

(e) ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—The land acquired by the Secretary under subsection (b) shall become part of the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge and be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to the National Wildlife Refuge System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3006, introduced by our colleague from California (Mr. CALVERT), authorizes an equal value land exchange of private and Federal property. The bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to convey 80 acres of Bureau of Land Management lands in California to River Bottom Farms.

In exchange, River Bottom Farms would be required to donate a 40-acre parcel in Arizona to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge.

Both land transfers will be subject to valid existing rights, rights-of-way, and other valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance. The transaction will be executed as an

equal value exchange with values determined by appraisals conducted in accordance with Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

In the event the exchange difference is a detriment to the United States, River Bottom Farms will be required to reimburse the Federal Government to ensure that there is no cost to the American taxpayers.

I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3006 is commonsense legislation that directs a land exchange between the Federal Government and a private citizen. The land to be conveyed is 80 acres of BLM land in Riverside County, California, that has limited conservation value and is only suitable for farming.

In return, the exchange will add two parcels of land contiguous to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge that will improve the management efficiency of that refuge.

The refuge lies in the flood plain of the lower Colorado River and is surrounded by desert ridges and washes that serve as the lifeline for thousands of species of animals including the iconic bald eagle that call the refuge its home.

I am pleased to see this bill come to the floor under suspension. This is a bill I have worked on for many years when the refuge was in my district, and I applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for taking the lead and seeing it through. Although the refuge is no longer in my district, the area is still important to the people of Arizona and my constituents.

H.R. 3006 is supported by a bipartisan congressional coalition that does not always see eye to eye on many issues, but I am glad to see that we can all agree on this.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the author of this legislation.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the management of our vast amount of Federal lands in our West is a complex challenge that requires the constant attention of our Federal agencies and Congress.

□ 1715

The legislation before the House today, H.R. 3006, would transfer 40 acres of privately-owned land to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona, and in exchange, the Federal Government would transfer 80 acres of isolated Bureau of Land Management land into private ownership. The 80